G. R. S. IX-5

Previous references

File No. 1920: 21

Serial Nos (A/42)

Later references

Inw 377-27-1-6

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 9—10

Part B for October 1921

SUBJECT.

Devaraj Urs, merchant Tumkur informs him that order already passed cannot be reconsidered

---

End. No. 1894/M.7. 25-20-10

By 7.10.21.

Draft sub

26/9/21

Secretary) 26/9/21

2100-219

27.9.21 Draft approved

Secy

25.9.21

26/9/21

1894

253-20-10) 7.10.21

To, Mr. T. A. Sanjeeva -
Secty
Merchant, Tumkur

Informs him that Govt
regret that they cannot
reconsider the orders
already passed in the
matter

To

His Highness

Sri Krishnarajendra Wodayar Bahadur, G.C.S.I.,

Maharaja of Mysore, M Y S O R E.

May It Please Your Highness:

The humble memorial of T.A. Sanjeeva Setty, son of late Adiseshayya, Merchant, Tumkur;

Most Respectfully begs leave to submit:

That the memorialist gave a loan of Rs.1,600/- to His Holiness The Swami of Sivaganga on the eve of his departure to Pondy on a pro note. That after his death the Mutt was taken chargee of by the Benign Government.

That on petitioning the Government as well as Your Noble Highness, the memorialist was called upon to produce his accounts and the pro note, which was done accordingly.

That after a few months when personally approached it was suggested to the memorialist by the Superintendent of the Muzrai Department that in case the memorialist would agree to receive just the half of the value of the pro note, the matter would be recommended and the amount paid.

That the memorialist seeing no other go had to give his consent. After this he was asked to come within a week for final settlement.

That the memorialist went accordingly but in vain. Now an endorsement dated 26-7-21 (No.237-41) has been issued to me stating that the debt even if it has really been contracted is not binding on the Mutt ... and that no portion of the revenue can be paid towards the liquidation of the debts, if any contracted by the Swami.

That this endorsement has taken the memorialist by utter surprise. The Muzrai Superintendent himself has seen the pro-note and the accounts of the memorialist, as well the accounts of the Mutt. It is only after being fully convinced that the debt was contracted for the use of the Mutt and as a matter of fact that the funds so borrowed were sepnt for the Mutt he took chagre of the pro note. Further it is also apparent that out of the funds borrowed from the memorialist provisions &c., have been purchased for the sake of the Mutt, but never for the personal benefit of the Swami, which the memorialist sincerely believes that ~~the~~ His Holiness the Swamiji had no other concern except the Mutt. Almost all the mutt subordinates are being paid out of the mutt revenues. That under such circumstances, the endorsement granted is highly unjust and also provoking.

That the memorialist therefore prays that Your Highness may graciously be pleased to direct the payment of the sum due to the memorialist and thus render Divine Justice.

Bangalore.
12th September 1921.

Encl

To

Mr T A Sanjeeva Reddy

Son of late Mr. Seshagiri,

1894 Merchant, Guntur.

Mem 255-20-10

7.10.21

With reference to his

Memorial dt 12th Sept. 21

to H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore

in the matter of the Amount due on

~~Mr Sanjeeva Reddy's Decree in his favour~~

Mr Sanjeeva Reddy's late husband

of the Inam village matt,

Mr. T.A. Sanjeeva Reddy is

informed that for the reasons

that ~~they cannot be~~ the orders already

issued in the matter cannot

be reconsidered

By O.

28.9.21

26/9/21

Sec to Mun dept

26/9/21